

D 651
.T9 L6
Copy 1

D 651
.T9 L6
Copy 1

No. 41.

ADDRESS
OF
W. A. LLOYD,

LATE OF THE AUSTRALIAN IMPERIAL FORCES
IN THE NEAR EAST.

Delivered in the
CENTRAL HALL, LIVERPOOL,
JANUARY 8th, 1920.

*The Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor of Liverpool
in the Chair.*

Monograph

THE ANGLO-HELLENIC LEAGUE,
43, ALDWYCH, W.C.2.

1920.

THE ANGLO-HELLENIC LEAGUE

OFFICERS, COUNCIL and COMMITTEE for 1918.

Presidents.

Sir FRANCIS ELLIOT, G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.

His Excellency J. GENNADIUS, G.C.V.O.

Vice-Presidents.

Commander C. BELLAIRS, M.P.

Commander H. S. CARDALE.

JOHN DILLON, M.P.

Sir ARTHUR EVANS, D.Litt., P.S.A.

G. A. MACMILLAN, Hon. D.Litt.

RONALD M'NEILL, M.P.

Sir JOHN SANDYS, Litt.D., F.B.A.

A. F. WHYTE.

Chairman.

THE HON. W. PEMBER REEVES.

Acting Chairman.

R. M. BURROWS, D.Litt.

Council.

Professor A. M. ANDRÉADES.

Mrs. PHILIP BAKER.

T. A. BURLUMI.

D. J. CASSAVETTI.

Rev. W. C. COMPTON.

*S. DELTA.

Mrs. EMBIRICOS.

Professor ERNEST GARDNER.

Mrs. LAMBRINUDI.

Dr. A. MANUEL.

L. M. MESSINESI.

Z. G. MICHALINOS.

Professor J. L. MYRES.

A. PALLIS.

Miss M. PALLIS.

G. H. PERRIS.

D. P. PETROCOCHINO.

Sir FREDERICK POLLOCK.

ALEX. RALLI.

Mrs. PEMBER REEVES.

E. M. RODOCANACHI.

Mrs. SACHS.

A. G. SYMONDS.

P. TEOFANI.

Mrs. VLASTO.

Sir C. WALSTON.

Mrs. WATSON-TAYLOR.

G. B. ZOCHONIS.

* Chairman of the Athens Executive Committee,

Together with the members of the Executive Committee.

Executive Committee.

CHAIRMAN and

ACTING CHAIRMAN.

Sir A. H. CROSFIELD, Bart.

Lady CROSFIELD.

N. EUMORFOPOULOS

(Hon. Secretary).

A. C. IONIDES.

G. MARCHETTI.

JOHN MAVROGORDATO

Lady MEIKLEJOHN.

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY.

Miss SCHILIZZI.

HAROLD SPENDER.

A. ZYGOURAS

(Hon. Treasurer).

Office.

43, ALDWYCH, W.C.2. Telephone: Central 2967.

Bankers.

THE LONDON COUNTY, WESTMINSTER & PARR'S BANK,
36, St. James Street, S.W.1.

THE
ANGLO-HELLENIC LEAGUE.

ADDRESS OF W. A. LLOYD.

My Lord Mayor,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Demobilised from the Australian Imperial Forces at Cairo in February last, I have spent the interval in a systematic study of conditions in Turkey under the Armistice. Without hesitation I affirm that those conditions are not only a disgrace to Turkey but to allegedly civilised Europe which allows them to continue. I have come straight from Turkey with the object of rousing Europe to a sense of its responsibility in this matter. I stayed a few days in Paris interviewing prominent international politicians, with little or no practical result. Everywhere expressions of sympathy, but everywhere a most damnable inertia, and a disinclination to translate words into deeds.

One prominent international statesman, whose name is a household word, cynically told me that the only way to rouse Europe would be to bribe the Turk to massacre a few thousand French and English children along with their Armenian and Greek victims. I am reluctantly forced to

the conclusion that nothing but the pressure of a strong and well-informed public opinion will move the politicians to action.

I refuse to believe that Christian chivalry died when Acre fell. While I do not believe that the Turkish problem is primarily a religious problem at all, whether Christian or Mohammedan, yet it must surely mean something that many of those who to-day are being massacred in Turkey are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. For all of them the blessed Symbol of their faith is our Symbol too. Pitiableness calls to great strength. Our account with Turkey goes back not five, but five hundred years, and now is the time to settle it—not in any spirit of vindictiveness, but in a spirit of justice to all concerned.

My personal knowledge of Turkey and the Turk goes back nearly a quarter of a century. I was present in Constantinople during the Armenian massacres in 1896-7. Only the other day at Aidin, in Asia Minor, I helped to gather the horribly mutilated bodies of men, women, and little children who had been barbarously done to death by Turkish troops for no other crime than that of being Christian. On that fateful May afternoon in 1453 when the last of the Imperial Palæologi fell valiantly defending the city of the Cæsars, it was an Oriental barbarian who supplanted the Byzantine Power on the Bosphorus, and five hundred years have not altered him, unless it be for the worse.

Officially, hostilities ceased in Turkey on the signing of the Armistice a year ago. Actually, there is to-day a well-equipped and well-organised

Turkish army in the field, engaged in the systematic murder of the Christian population of the Empire, men, women, and children.

Constantinople officially disclaims responsibility for the existence of this army, and professes to regret its activities which, it states, it is powerless to prevent. But Constantinople claims sovereignty over the territory occupied by Mustapha Kemal Pasha and his troops, and is, therefore morally and in international law legally responsible for the maintenance of public order. And the super-politicians in Paris, some of whom are not quite certain whether Cilicia is in Asia or Europe, are apparently just as impotent as the simulacrum of a Government on the shores of the Bosphorus. Paris, equally with Constantinople, must share responsibility for the regime of murder and outrage to-day in Turkey.

It is imperative that the Turkish problem be faced immediately. Every day's delay affords opportunity for Kemal and his bandit army to strengthen their position, and further weakens the authority, already dangerously weak, of Constantinople. Kemal makes no secret of his intentions in the event of Constantinople signing a peace involving partition of the Empire. He proposes to ignore the Constantinople Government altogether, and seize the reins of power himself.

He is quite capable of doing so. Even now Constantinople dare not send regular troops against him for the simple reason that they join forces with him. I myself have seen recently hundreds of officers and men in the uniform of the regular army with the insurgent forces. The

Turk is not a particularly intellectual individual, but he is not altogether a fool, and he is well aware of the fact that he has friends in Europe, who are moving heaven and earth to save him from the consequences of his defeat.

THE SPIRITUAL PREROGATIVES OF THE SULTAN.

I come now to one of the most difficult and important aspects of the complicated Turkish problem. It is generally known that the Sultan is the Caliph, or spiritual head, of the Sunni, or Orthodox, Mohammedan world, comprising a majority of those who profess the faith of Islam. It is not generally known that he also claims the right, on historical grounds, to exercise certain spiritual functions in connection with the Christian Church which were formerly the exclusive prerogatives of the Roman Emperors. The Eastern Holy Roman Empire included the four historic Patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople and Jerusalem. The emperors exercised the right of confirmation of election of any Patriarch, and this right has been claimed and exercised by successive Sultans from the fall of the Empire in the fifteenth century. It is something more than a merely historically interesting survival of mediæval times. A Patriarch may be canonically elected, but unless he obtains confirmation of election by the Sultan he cannot exercise the functions of his office. It will come as a surprise to the average Christian and a shock to the orthodox Moslem, to be told that the Sultan confirms, or otherwise, the election of a Patriarch.

in the same words as his Christian predecessors, invoking the aid of the Holy Ghost, and speaking in the name of the Holy Trinity !

His Beatitude Fotios, present Patriarch of Alexandria and undoubtedly one of the greatest spiritual and intellectual forces in Christendom to-day, was previously elected Patriarch of Jerusalem. The Sultan refused to confirm the election, and banished His Beatitude to the fortress-monastery of Sinai, where he spent his enforced leisure learning Russian, so as to be better able to minister to the spiritual needs of the host of Russian pilgrims who flock to the Holy Land. It is interesting to note that the claim of the Sultan to confirm or veto the election of a Patriarch is actually older than the assumption of the Caliphate.

TURKISH SULTANS AND THE CALIPHATE.

Selim I, of infamous memory, was the first Turkish Sultan to claim the Caliphate, in 1516, whereas the claim to interfere in the election of a Patriarch dates from the fall of Constantinople in 1453. The date of Mohammed's birth is uncertain, but it was somewhere about 570, and he died in 632. On the death of the great Law-giver of Arabia, and Mohammed was a truly great man, his followers quarrelled amongst themselves over the question of his successors, and that quarrel has divided the Islamic world up to the present day. The Sunni, or Orthodox Moslems, claim that Omar is the rightful successor of the Prophet, while the Shiah Moslems, mostly Persian, refuse to recognise the claims of Omar, and follow Ali. Both men were relations of

Mohammed, and members of the Koreish, the tribe, or clan, to which Mohammed himself belonged. The Shiah world has never recognised the claim of the Turkish Sultans to the Caliphate. That claim was never heard of until the year 1516, when Selim I, acquired the title by purchase from the Fatimite Caliph of Egypt. I am not now concerned with the legality of that purchase in Islamic Canon Law, or whether the Fatimite Caliph was a free agent. My point is this, and it is very important, the earlier Sultans of Turkey did not claim the Caliphate, and even those to-day who acknowledge the Sultan as Caliph do not pretend even that there is any warrant either in the Koran or Canon Law for the Turkish claim. My own view is that the question is one for Mohammedans themselves to decide, and that it would be an unwarranted presumption for Christians to dictate to Moslems in the matter at all.

THE CASE OF INDIA.

The idea that we must keep one eye on India in all our dealings with Turkey, that we must condone the crimes of Turkey in deference to Indian Moslem opinion, is not only wholly mischievous, but is an insult to India. Speaking generally, Indian Moslems are far better educated than the Turks, and they are certainly intellectually superior. No intelligent Indian Moslem would wish to identify Islam with the crimes of Turkey, crimes that are only too well authenticated. Prominent Indian Moslems have recently pleaded in the Press for the magnanimous treatment of Turkey, mostly on religious grounds. As one to whom the idea of a "Carthaginian

Peace" in relation to any of our late enemies in the field is altogether hateful, I entirely sympathise with the idea that the peace settlement with Turkey should be tempered with mercy. But if Turkey is to escape punishment because she is Moslem, then Germany has a greater claim to leniency because she is, nominally at any rate, Christian !

India showed a magnificent loyalty during the war. Indian Moslem troops fought side by side with the Christian troops of the Empire against the Turk, as did also the Moslem Arabs. Whatever former wars might have been, the present war was not in any sense a religious war. Those who are seeking to prove that there is an organised conspiracy to ruin Turkey because the Turk is a Moslem, in other words, that the issue is between Islam and Christianity, have a terrible responsibility to answer for. Whether the Turk remains in Constantinople or returns to Asia, the spiritual authority of the Sultan is not interfered with. The loss of the temporal power by the Popes has not lessened the spiritual authority of the Vatican. As a matter of fact, the long Pontificate of Leo XIII raised the spiritual authority of the Pope in the eyes of the whole Christian world to a very much higher level than it stood on the death of Pius IX. It is not too much to hope that, relieved of the elements of internal disorder that has brought about the ruin of the once proud Empire of Suleiman, the spiritual authority of the Sultan, as head of the Mohammedan world, will actually be greater than it is at present.

TURKISH CHARACTERISTICS.

I have already stated that it was an Oriental barbarian who supplanted the Byzantine Power on the Bosphorus. Admittedly the original barbarian possessed certain military virtues that compelled the admiration even of his enemies. In a sense, he was more chivalrous than most of his contemporaries, although his chivalry was curiously circumscribed by his Oriental mentality. His mental processes are not ours, and his standards of right and wrong differ entirely from those of Europe. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that we shall never understand the Turk so long as we apply European standards of judgment to him. The Turk is the most amazing contradiction in the world. He is kind to animals, but will ruthlessly murder little children, provided they are not Turkish children. He will deny himself to feed his horse, but he treats his women as though they were lower than any animal. He is extraordinarily indolent. He does not build roads, or engage in commerce. Modern civilisation, and all that it connotes, is highly distasteful to him. Although incapable of governing others, he is easily governed, provided his religious fanaticism is not roused by self-seeking mischief-makers like those two consummate scoundrels Enver and Talaat. Any partition of the Empire is bound to leave a Turkish minority under Christian rule. But in Macedonia where a large number of Turks have come under Greek rule, there has been no trouble of any kind. The action of the Greek authorities in restoring the mosques in Macedonia to their rightful owners after they had been forcibly taken by the Bulgarians created a good impression amongst the

Moslem population. Macedonian Moslem notables have publicly expressed themselves as being highly satisfied with Greek rule. And the same thing will occur in Asia Minor in regard to the Moslem Minority there when the beautiful blue and white flag of Greece waves over these ancient Greek lands.

GREEKS IN ASIA MINOR.

Mention of Asia Minor brings me to the events which have occurred in that part of the Turkish Empire since the signing of the Armistice. While European Turkophiles are busy endeavouring to prove to an incredulous world that the Turk is not such a bad sort, that he did not, and could not possibly, do any of the barbarous things he is charged with doing, the Turk still goes on his old way, murdering right and left, utterly regardless of the consequences. To-day Armenia and Anatolia present a picture of misery with hardly a parallel in history. Since Turkey signed the Armistice the massacre of the Christians has continued uninterruptedly.

On May the 14th last by order of the Paris Conference a Greek army was landed at Smyrna. The events connected with the landing of the Greek troops have been so distorted and misrepresented by interested persons in Asia Minor itself, as well as in Europe, that those not on the spot might well be excused for arriving at totally wrong ideas concerning what actually took place. First of all, and to prevent misconception, let me say I was not present at the actual landing. I arrived in Smyrna from Syria a few days afterwards. But I had the advantage of conversing with Turks,

Armenians, Jews, as well as Greeks, who were actually present, and I carefully checked the various accounts I received. It is admitted that the Turks and not the Greeks were the first to open fire.

The day before the landing the Turkish authorities had released all the Turkish prisoners in the gaols. Many of these criminals were in possession of arms when captured afterwards. Nobody contends that it was the Greeks who armed these criminals. Colonel Zaferio, a thoroughly capable and high-minded officer, was in charge of the Greek troops. His instructions to his men were that there was to be no violence of any kind, and that the Occupation was to be carried out peaceably. Stress was laid particularly on the fact that not merely Turkish but certain European influences were at work to discredit the Greek Occupation, and that every Greek must make it a point of honour to do nothing that might help the enemies of Greece. The Greek troops behaved splendidly and only after repeated provocation did the Greek commander reluctantly order his men to open fire. Then Hell was let loose. No Greek denies that certain of the Greek population used the occasion to get some of their own back. But the same thing would have happened in any other large city. And Smyrna is a cosmopolitan city of about half a million of mutually antagonistic nationalities. The Greek authorities sternly suppressed any attempts at sabotage, and the disturbances lasted less than two hours. Speaking as a soldier, and an Australian, I emphatically contend that under similar circumstances in

Australia, not two hours, but two days, would not have sufficed to restore order. So much for the landing of the Greek troops in Smyrna.

And now let me speak about the massacres of unarmed Greek villages in the interior of Asia Minor, of which I personally know something. The Greek troops occupied Aidin, in the hinterland of Smyrna, on May 30. On July 1 they were forced to evacuate the city owing to an enormously superior Turkish attack. After receiving reinforcements from Smyrna, on July 3 the Greek army marched on Aidin. The Turkish army did not wait to give battle, but retreated into the Turkish zone. When the Greek army evacuated Aidin the population of the city was, roughly, fifty-three thousand—it is difficult to estimate the actual population of any Turkish town—Turkish statistics being unreliable: on the re-entry of the Greek troops the total population of Aidin was less than four thousand. About one third of the population consisted of Turks, the remainder were Greeks with about four or five thousand Armenians, and Jews. The whole of the Turkish population with the exception of about four hundred accompanied the Turkish army on their retreat. The Turks took with them all the wealthy Greeks for purposes of ransom and all, or nearly all, the Greek women amounting to some thousands for purposes that can be better imagined than described. Better for them had they been murdered outright.

When the Greek reinforcements were being sent to Aidin I made application at Smyrna, to General Nider for permission to accompany them. I stipulated that I should be free to converse

with Turks, Armenians, and Jews, as well as Greeks, and that my movements were not to be hampered in any way. General Nider, commander of the Greek Army of Occupation somehow always reminds me of General Gordon; not the Gordon of Lord Cromer's "Egypt" who habitually consulted the Book of Isaiah when confronted with a military difficulty, but the Gordon of the popular imagination, the Gordon who personifies the best ideals of English chivalry. General Nider not only gave me the permission I asked for, but issued instructions that I was to be afforded every facility to see everything and to go everywhere throughout the Greek zone of occupation. Incidentally I visited also the Italian and Turkish zones.

When I arrived at Aidin by the military train the sight was awful. The whole of the Greek quarter comprising two-thirds of the town was in ruins. The dead were lying everywhere in thousands.

European Turkophiles apologise for the Turkish atrocities at Aidin by saying that the town was destroyed by the bombardment of the Turkish and Greek troops. If that is so, it is curious that to-day the whole of the Turkish quarter is intact. Further, the dead consisted solely of Greeks.

In company with a British naval officer, Lieutenant Hodder, I visited Ormurlou, a Greek village about eight miles from Aidin. Ormurlou is a second Cawnpore. When the Turkish army retired from Aidin they passed through Ormurlou and murdered the whole population, men, women, and children, and threw the bodies down the

town well. At the request of Lieutenant Hodder the Greek Commandant ordered his men to bring up the bodies for our inspection. I can only leave to the imagination the sight that met our eyes. The men who went down the well to bring up the bodies wore gas masks, and they, and all of us who viewed the horrible sight, could not trust ourselves to speak owing to the choking sensation in our throats. Would that British Turkophiles had been present, for it would have cured them of their mistaken love for the Turk.

THE BOY SCOUTS OF AIDIN.

Nothing so angers a Turk as the sight of a Greek boy in khaki. When the Greek troops occupied Smyrna and its hinterland, the Greeks organized Boy Scouts in the more important centres. At Aidin the Greek boys were enthusiastic to become scouts. When the Turks occupied Aidin after the Greek troops were forced to retire, they deliberately sought out the Boy Scouts and murdered them all in cold blood. The full story of the Greek Boy Scouts of Aidin has yet to be written, and it will prove to be an epic worthy of the heroic days of Greece.

I took particular pains to ascertain exactly what occurred in connection with the murder of these children, for they were little more than children, some of them being under fourteen years of age. I interviewed eye-witnesses, not only Greeks but Armenians and Jews. I possess the names of these young heroes, together with those of the Scout Masters, and members of the Scout Committee who were murdered with them. The Turkish soldiers asked each boy separately

to repeat a filthy phrase about Greece and M. Venizelos. Not one of them faltered in his duty, and all refused to comply with the Turkish demand. With tears streaming down their faces, these brave boys tried to sing the Greek National Hymn as they were being murdered. And yet to-day there are those who say that the spirit of old Greece is dead, and that the modern Greek has little of the old Greek blood in his veins, and nothing at all of the old Greek courage. Like other races, the modern Greek has not preserved the purity of the original stock, although there are isolated communities where the pure type still survives. But there is little of Alfred's blood in the modern Englishman, yet the glory of Alfred and the splendour of the Alfred tradition is the valued possession of every Englishman to-day.

Greek culture, Orthodox Christianity and the Graeco-Roman Imperial tradition made Asia Minor in the past the centre of a great civilisation. To-day in spite of repeated attempts by successive Sultans to Turkify the country by means of wholesale murder and the forcible deportation of the non-Turkish elements, Asia Minor is still predominantly Greek, and apparently will never be anything else. It is a significant fact that Hellenism is strongest to-day where it has suffered the most. Smyrna is more Greek than Athens, probably because Smyrna has suffered more.

How long are the Turks to be allowed to murder the unarmed inhabitants of Christian villages without effective protest from a Europe that calls itself Christian? On the slopes of Gallipoli, in the hot sands of the Arabian desert,

in the Jordan Valley, our dead are numbered in thousands. They fell gloriously — for what? Turkey is a beaten enemy. Are we to be robbed of the legitimate fruits of their sacrifice by the sinister efforts of European Turkophiles, and the moral cowardice of pettyfogging party politicians? Do these friends of the abominable Turk not realise that their campaign in favour of Turkey is an insult to our noble dead, and that they are traitors to the Allies? I realise the gravity of the charge, but, without qualification, I assert that the European Turkophiles and the supine politicians are morally responsible in great measure for the continued murder of Christians in Turkey.

TURKEY TO-MORROW.

Nothing is perfect in this world, and one despairs of an ideal solution of the Turkish problem. Sinister influences are at work in Europe, as well as in Turkey, to save the Turk and his Empire. Vested interests are working night and day to protect their pockets, using the most disgraceful means to accomplish their ends. Even governments are more concerned about the "Balance of Power" and real or imaginary gain to themselves, than about justice to the millions who suffer under the Turk. But the conscience of the civilised world has long ago condemned the Turk and all his ways. The great war will not have been fought in vain, if one of its consequences is the liberation of the Christian population of Turkey. The Paris Conference is hailed as the precursor of a new world. That prolific cause of war, secret diplomacy, stands condemned

and "Open Covenants, openly arrived at" is the new watchword in international diplomacy. The solution of the Turkish problem will prove a test case of the sincerity of those charged with the responsibility of creating this new and better world. The whole civilised world demands that the politicians in Paris shall do their duty fearlessly, and settle once and for all the Turkish question. We can all hope that the new Turkey, although no longer a great Power, will in the time to come qualify for membership in the League of Nations, by setting its house in order, and acting as a civilised State. The Turk has no one to blame but himself for his present plight. If his troubles will but convince him that the way of the transgressor is hard, and that nations, like individuals, must eventually pay the penalty of wrong doing, then there is hope even for Turkey.

Some Publications of the Anglo-Hellenic League.

The following pamphlets are obtainable at the Offices of the League, price 3d. each or 2/- a dozen.

4. **The Inaugural Meeting of the Anglo-Hellenic League** and a Letter by THE HON. W. P. REEVES on the *Ægean Islands and Epirus*.
5. **Northern Epirus in 1913**, a lecture by Colonel A. M. MURRAY, C.B., M.V.O.
7. **Albania and Epirus**, by THE HON. W. P. REEVES. (1913.)
9. **Books which we recommend to Members who intend to visit Greece**, by R. A. H. BICKFORD-SMITH.
10. **Greece and the Epirus Rising**.
12. **Letters relating to Greek Macedonia and the Expulsion of Greeks from Turkey** by A. PALLIS and others.
14. **The New Greece**, by R. M. BURROWS, D.Litt. (reprinted by permission from *The Quarterly Review*). (1914.)
15. Reprint of Review, by R. M. BURROWS (from *The Athenæum*), on the **Report of International Commission of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace** into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars.
16. Letter from a Correspondent in the Balkans—**The Northern Epirotes**, C. S. BUTLER.
18. **Annual General Meeting, February 19, 1915**. Address by THE HON. W. P. REEVES and list of publications.
19. **El. Venizelos and English Public Opinion**. Venizelos' Memoranda, etc.
20. **Trade between England and Greece**.
23. **Greece and To-morrow**, by Z. D. FERRIMAN. (1915.)
24. **England in the Balkans**, by JOHN MAVROGORDATO.
27. **Annual General Meeting, June 15, 1916**. Address by Dr. R. M. BURROWS, etc.
28. **Speech of M. E. Venizelos to the People**. (Greek and English.)
30. **Venizelos and his Fellow-Countrymen**, by Prof. P. N. URE.
31. **Address by M. A. Diomedes, Feb. 16, 1917**. (Greek and English.)
32. **Italy and Greece ; Roll of Honour of the Hellenic Community in London, etc.**
33. **Annual General Meeting, July 5, 1917**.
34. **The Abdication of King Constantine, June 12, 1917**. Articles by Dr. R. M. BURROWS.
35. **England's Welcome to Venizelos at the Mansion House, November 16, 1917**.
36. **The Anglo-Hellenic Alliance**. Speeches at the Mansion House, June 27, 1918, to celebrate the Anniversary of the Entry of Reunited Greece into the War.
37. **Annual General Meeting, July 11, 1918**.
38. **Retirement of M. Gennadius**.
39. **Annual General Meeting, June 20th, 1919**.
40. **The Turks, Cardinal Newman and The Council of Ten**, by the Very Rev. CANON WILLIAM BARRY, D.D.

EXTRA SERIES.

An Appeal for the Liberation and Union of the Hellenic Race, by the Hon. W. P. REEVES. (1918).

Some English Philhellenes, by Z. D. FERRIMAN.

- I. Frank Abney Hastings.
- II. Sir Charles James Napier.
- III. Thomas Gordon.
- V. John Pitt Kennedy.
- VI. Lord Guilford.
- VII. Sir Richard Church.

A Plea for a Civilized Epirus, by THE HON. W. P. REEVES.
Epirus and the Ægean.

Both published by the *ÆGEAN ISLANDS COMMITTEE*.



THE ANGLO-HELLENIC LEAGUE was founded in 1913
with the following objects :—

1. To defend the just claims and honour of Greece.
2. To remove existing prejudices and prevent future misunderstandings between the British and Hellenic races, as well as between the Hellenic and other races of South-Eastern Europe.
3. To spread information concerning Greece and stimulate interest in Hellenic matters.
4. To improve the social, educational, commercial and political relations of the two countries.
5. To promote travel in Greece and secure improved facilities for it.

Inquiries and applications for Membership should be addressed to the Secretary of the Anglo-Hellenic League, at the Offices of the League, 43, Aldwych, W.C.2.

The Officers of the League will always be glad to give to intending travellers in Greece or any persons interested in Hellenic affairs any information which they are in a position to supply.

Extracts from the Rules of the League.

25. The names of all candidates wishing to become Members of the League shall be submitted to a meeting of the Executive, and at their next meeting the Executive shall proceed to the election of candidates so proposed. No such election shall be valid unless the Candidate receives the votes of the majority of those present.

26. The annual subscription of Members shall be 5s., due and payable on the first of January each year; this annual subscription may be compounded for by a single payment of £10, entitling compounders to be Members of the League for life, without further payment.

27. The payment of the annual subscription, or of the life composition, entitles each Member to receive a copy of the ordinary publications of the League.